## STATE OF MONTANA BEFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

IN THE MATTER OF UNIT CLARIFICATION NO. 3-89:

WOLF POINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 45 AND 45A,

Petitioner,

vs.

RECOMMENDED ORDER

WOLF POINT CUSTODIANS' ASSOCIATION, MEA, NEA

Respondent,

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

## I. INTRODUCTION

On February 24, 1989, the Petitioner filed a request for unit clarification with the Board of Personnel Appeals requesting that Merle Doornek be excluded from the unit defined as custodian and/or maintenance employees excluding custodian substitutes, maintenance substitutes, cooks, bus drivers, school nurses, teachers, teacher aids, secretaries, clerks, licensed professionals and those excluded by Title 39, Chapter 31, MCA.

The petition requested that Mr. Doornek be excluded as a supervisory employee under 39-31-103 (3) MCA.

The petition was served upon Tom Verwolf, President of the Wolf Point Custodians' Association on February 27, 1989.

On March 8, 1989, a Motion to Dismiss was filed by the Association on the grounds the petition did not comply with

Board rules.

The question has been briefed and with the Petitioner's submission of April 11, 1989, the matter is submitted.

## II. DISCUSSION

Board of Personnel Appeals rules concerning unit clarification are found at ARM 24.26.630. The rules provide that a petition can be filed with the Board only by a bargaining representative of the unit in question or by a public employer and only if:

- (a) there is no question concerning representation;
- (b) the parties to the agreement are neither engaged in negotiations nor within 120 days of the expiration of the agreement;
- (c) a petition for clarification has not been filed with the Board concerning substantially the same unit within the past twelve months immediately preceding the filing of the petition; and
- (d) no election has been held in substantially the same unit within the past twelve months immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

From the pleadings and based upon the Board's records it is apparent that the provisions of Sections (a), (c) and (d) have been met in that there are no questions concerning representation, no unit clarification over the same unit has

been filed within the preceding twelve months nor has an election over the unit in question been held within the previous twelve months. Moreover the Petitioner has standing to file the petition. At issue is whether the petition complies with 24.26.630 (1) (b).

The contract in question is "in effect until June 30, 1989" and remains in effect for additional one year periods unless notice is given by either party in February prior to the contract expiration date, (Attachment B of Petitioner's Brief in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss).

The petition was filed with the Board on February 24, 1989. A contract that is effective from a certain date "until" another date is construed as not including the date named after the word "until" unless there is a specific provision to the contrary, Hemisphere Steel Products, 131 NLRB 56, 47 LRRM 1595. (Also see ARM 24.26.203 and Rule 6(a) M.R. Civ. Proc.) Thus, for purposes of time calculation the petition was filed 126 days prior to contract expiration. The petition is timely for purposes of the rule. The remaining question then is whether the parties are "engaged in negotiations".

On February 17, 1989, the Association gave notice to the district by certified mail of its "desire to negotiate over the terms of a successor agreement." (See attachments to Respondent's Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss.) The

request was filed within the time frame established in the contract. There is no dispute that this occurred nor is there any dispute that the request had to be made in February.

The parties neither cite nor does it appear that the Board has defined the phrase "engaged in bargaining" as applied to filing a unit clarification petition. Relying in part on 39-31-305(2) MCA and in part on the generally accepted meaning of the word "engage" as defined in Black's Law Dictionary the Petitioner contends that the parties have to have had a meeting and/or exchanged proposals to be "engaged in bargaining". This argument is not persuasive.

39-31-305 (2) MCA deals with bargaining in good faith. To be "engaged in bargaining" has nothing to do with whether it is good or bad faith bargaining.

The Black's Law definition of engage is "to employ or involve one's self; to take part in; to embark on". The act of sending a letter to begin the bargaining process certainly meets the definition of "to involve one's self; to take part in" or "embark on". The action of opening the contract is akin to filing a lawsuit. Just as you are engaged in a lawsuit when the papers are filed and served so too are you "engaged in bargaining" when you give written notice you desire to negotiate. It is the entire process which the rules refer to, not just the physical act of holding meetings

1 and exchanging proposals. 2 3 III. RECOMMENDED ORDER 4 The unit clarification petition is dismissed as not 5 conforming with ARM 24.26.630.(1) (b). 6 Entered and dated this 1912 day of April , 1989. 7 8 BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS 9 10 11 John Andrew Hearing Examiner 12 Exceptions to this Recommended Order may be filed NOTICE: 13 within twenty days of service. If no exceptions are filed the Recommended Order will become the final order of the 14 Board Of Personnel Appeals. 15 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 16 I, month facobor , do hereby certify that a true and forrect copy of this document was mailed to the following on the 1400 day of Opil , 1989. 17 18 Emilie Loring 19 Hilley and Loring 500 Daly Ave. 20 Missoula, MT 59801 21 Rick D'Hooge Montana School Boards Association 22 1 South Montana Helena, MT 59601 23 24

25

WLFPTUC.SAV